

IN THE

Court of Appeal of the State of California

IN AND FOR THE

Fifth Appellate District

- F049939 *Peraino v. Merced Irrigation Dist. et al.*,**
The judgment is affirmed. Costs on appeal awarded to respondents. Harris, Acting P.J.
We concur: Wiseman, J.; Kane, J.
[NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS]
- F051712 *Gunitite v. Pressure Concrete, Inc. et al.***
Appellant having filed an abandonment and/or request for dismissal of appeal, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal in the above-entitled action is dismissed.
- F051663 *Tanika B. v. The Superior Court of Madera County; Madera County Department of Social Services/Child Welfare Services***
Let an extraordinary writ issue directing respondent court to vacate its order of November 7, 2006, setting the section 366.26 hearing. Respondent court is further directed to conduct a new review hearing and cause notice of the hearing to be provided as set forth in Rule 5.570. Vartabedian, Harris, Cornell (7 pgs).
By the Court.
[NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS]
- F051713 *Beatriz B., v. Madera Co. Dept. of Social Services/Child Welfare Services***
The petition for extraordinary writ is dismissed. The opinion is final forthwith as to this court.
By the Court.
[NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS]
- F047893 *People v. Rodrigues***
The judgment is modified to stay execution of sentence on counts 4, 25, 47, 48, and 55 pursuant to section 654. The trial court is ordered to correct the abstract of judgment as to counts 25, 47, 48 and 55. (See fn. 3, ante.) As so modified and in all other respects, the judgment is affirmed. Dawson, J.
We concur: Harris, Acting P.J.; Kane, J.
[NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS]

IN THE

Court of Appeal of the State of California

IN AND FOR THE

Fifth Appellate District

F051585 In re Nature L., a Minor,

Kern Co. Dept. of Human Services v. Ken L.

No brief or request for extension of time having been filed within the time provided, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal in the above-entitled action is dismissed.

F050493 People v. Garibay

Appellant's petition for rehearing filed herein is denied.

F050309 In re Carlos H., a Minor

Counsel having failed to request oral argument in the above-entitled case, oral argument is deemed waived in accordance with the provisions of a notice heretofore mailed to counsel and the cause is submitted.

F050309 In re Carlos H., a Minor

The judgment is affirmed in part, reversed in part and remanded to the trial court with modifications.

By the Court.

[NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS]

F051272 In re Derek S. et al., Minors

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal in the above-entitled action is dismissed.

IN THE

Court of Appeal of the State of California

IN AND FOR THE

Fifth Appellate District

F047511 People v. Pedro Ramirez Calixio

Pursuant to the order filed in the Supreme Court of the United States in the above-entitled action vacating the judgment and remanding the case to the Court of Appeal of California, Fifth Appellate District, for further consideration in light of *Cunningham v. California* 549 U.S. ____ (2007), the remittitur issued on October 17, 2006, is ordered recalled.

The Clerk of the Superior Court of Fresno County is directed to return said remittitur to this court forthwith.

Further, this court's judgment entered on July 19, 2006, is ordered vacated. The appeal is reinstated.

Based on the reinstatement of this appeal, counsel previously appointed will continue with the representation of appellant in this matter.

Parties are to refer to the "Order Regarding Supplemental Briefing" posted on this court's website on February 21, 2007 for further instructions.

F045695 People v. Rogelio Robles

Pursuant to the order filed in the Supreme Court of the United States in the above-entitled action vacating the judgment and remanding the case to the Court of Appeal of California, Fifth Appellate District, for further consideration in light of *Cunningham v. California* 549 U.S. ____ (2007), the remittitur issued on January 11, 2006, is ordered recalled.

The Clerk of the Superior Court of Tulare County is directed to return said remittitur to this court forthwith.

Further, this court's judgment entered on October 19, 2005, is ordered vacated. The appeal is reinstated.

Based on the reinstatement of this appeal, counsel previously appointed will continue with the representation of appellant in this matter.

Parties are to refer to the "Order Regarding Supplemental Briefing" posted on this court's website on February 21, 2007 for further instructions.

IN THE

Court of Appeal of the State of California

IN AND FOR THE

Fifth Appellate District

F047215 People v. Carlos Marcos Lopez

Pursuant to the order filed in the Supreme Court of the United States in the above-entitled action vacating the judgment and remanding the case to the Court of Appeal of California, Fifth Appellate District, for further consideration in light of *Cunningham v. California* 549 U.S. ____ (2007), the remittitur issued on June 23, 2006, is ordered recalled. The Clerk of the Superior Court of Fresno County is directed to return said remittitur to this court forthwith. Further, this court's judgment entered on April 3, 2006, is ordered vacated. The appeal is reinstated.

Based on the reinstatement of this appeal, counsel previously appointed will continue with the representation of appellant in this matter. Parties are to refer to the "Order Regarding Supplemental Briefing" posted on this court's website on February 21, 2007 for further instructions.

F047975 People v. Robert Arriaga

Pursuant to the order filed in the Supreme Court of the United States in the above-entitled action vacating the judgment and remanding the case to the Court of Appeal of California, Fifth Appellate District, for further consideration in light of *Cunningham v. California* 549 U.S. ____ (2007), the remittitur issued on March 27, 2006, is ordered recalled. The Clerk of the Superior Court of Fresno County is directed to return said remittitur to this court forthwith.

Further, this court's judgment entered on January 6, 2006, is ordered vacated. The appeal is reinstated.

Based on the reinstatement of this appeal, counsel previously appointed will continue with the representation of appellant in this matter. Parties are to refer to the "Order Regarding Supplemental Briefing" posted on this court's website on February 21, 2007 for further instructions.

IN THE

Court of Appeal of the State of California

IN AND FOR THE

Fifth Appellate District

F048904 People v. Travis Manuel

Pursuant to the order filed in the Supreme Court of the United States in the above-entitled action vacating the judgment and remanding the case to the Court of Appeal of California, Fifth Appellate District, for further consideration in light of *Cunningham v. California* 549 U.S. ____ (2007), the remittitur issued on September 5, 2006, is ordered recalled.

The Clerk of the Superior Court of Fresno County is directed to return said remittitur to this court forthwith.

Further, this court's judgment entered on June 20, 2006, is ordered vacated. The appeal is reinstated.

Based on the reinstatement of this appeal, counsel previously appointed will continue with the representation of appellant in this matter.

Parties are to refer to the "Order Regarding Supplemental Briefing" posted on this court's website on February 21, 2007 for further instructions.

F046307 People v. Charles E. Turner

Pursuant to the order filed in the Supreme Court of the United States in the above-entitled action vacating the judgment and remanding the case to the Court of Appeal of California, Fifth Appellate District, for further consideration in light of *Cunningham v. California* 549 U.S. ____ (2007), the remittitur issued on February 28, 2006, is ordered recalled.

The Clerk of the Superior Court of Fresno County is directed to return said remittitur to this court forthwith.

Further, this court's judgment entered on December 16, 2005, is ordered vacated. The appeal is reinstated.

Based on the reinstatement of this appeal, counsel previously appointed will continue with the representation of appellant in this matter.

Parties are to refer to the "Order Regarding Supplemental Briefing" posted on this court's website on February 21, 2007 for further instructions.